

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-32 are cancelled. Claims 33-63 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

The specification has been amended to better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Claims 37-63 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, claims 33-36, 38, 40-46, 48, 51-52, 57, and 59-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ludwig (U.S. Patent No. 5,758,079). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Ludwig.

Independent claims 33-36 have been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes.

As amended herein, claim 33 recites:

digital broadcast receiving means for receiving a multiplexed digital broadcast signal within which advertising information includes link information showing a linking method between the advertising information and detailed information regarding the advertising information[.]

(Emphasis added.) The relied on sections of Ludwig neither disclose nor suggest a multiplexed digital broadcast signal within which advertising information includes link information

showing a linking method between the advertising information and detailed information regarding the advertising information.

It follows, for at least the above reasons, that the relied on sections of Ludwig do not disclose or suggest the combination defined in claim 33 and therefore do not anticipate the claim.

Independent claims 34-36 each call for features similar to those set out in the above excerpt of claim 33. Each of these claims is therefore patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Ludwig for at least the reasons set out above regarding claim 33.

Claims 38, 40-42, 48, 51-52, and 59-63 depend from claim 33; claims 38, 40-46, 48, 51-52, and 59-63 depend from claim 34; claims 38, 40-42, 48, 51-52, 57, and 59-63 depend from claim 35; and claims 38, 40-46, 48, 51-52, 57, and 59-63 depend from claim 36. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on sections of Ludwig at least for the same reasons as its parent claim.

Turning now to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a): (i) claim 37 was rejected unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Suh (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,265), (ii) claim 39 was rejected unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Bryer (U.S. Patent No. 4,780,757), (iii) claim 47 was rejected unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 5,517,321), (iv) claim 49 was rejected unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Hashimoto (U.S. Patent No. 4,982,441), (v) claim 50 was rejected unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Stephens (U.S. Patent No. 5,707,288), (vi) claim 53 was rejected unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Sudman (U.S. Patent No. 5,601,436), (vii) claims 54-55 were rejected unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Sudman and further in view of Montague (U.S. Patent No. 5,761, 669), (viii) claim 56 was rejected unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Miller (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,701), and

(ix) claim 58 was rejected unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Herz (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,722). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

Claims 37, 39, 50, and 53-55 depend from claim 33, claims 37, 39, 47, 49, 50, and 53-55 depend from claim 34, and claims 37, 39, 50, 53-56, and 58 depend from claim 35, claims 37, 39, 47, 49, 50, 53-56, and 58 depend from claim 36. Therefore, each of the claims is distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Ludwig for at least the same reasons.

Neither the relied-on sections of Suh, the relied-on sections of Bryer, the relied-on sections of Yoshida, the relied-on sections of Hashimoto, the relied-on sections of Stephens, the relied-on sections of Sudman, the relied-on sections of Montague, the relied-on sections of Miller, nor the relied-on sections of Herz overcome the deficiencies of the relied-on sections of Ludwig.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a).

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.


Application No.: 10/032,773

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-1214 DIV

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: November 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

940265\_1.DOC